arXiv:1608.04947v1 [math.CV] 17 Aug 2016

Quasi-normality induced by differential inequalities

Jürgen Grahl and Shahar Nevo

Abstract

We show that the family $\mathcal{F}_k$ of all meromorphic functions f in a domain D satisfying

$$\frac{|f^{(k)}|}{1+|f|}(z) \geq C \qquad \text{for all } z \in D$$

(where k is a natural number and $C > 0$) is quasi-normal. The proof relies mainly on the Zalcman-Pang rescaling method.

Keywords: quasi-normal families, normal families, Zalcman-Pang lemma, Marty's theorem, differential inequalities

Mathematics Subject Classification: 30D45, 30A10

1 Introduction and statement of results

According to Marty's theorem, a family $\mathcal{F}$ of meromorphic functions in a domain D in the complex plane $\mathbb{C}$ is normal (in the sense of Montel) if and only if the family $\{f^\# : f \in \mathcal{F}\}$ of the corresponding spherical derivatives $f^\# := \frac{|f'|}{1+|f|^2}$ is locally uniformly bounded in D.

In [3] we studied families of meromorphic functions whose spherical derivatives are bounded away from zero and proved the following counterpart to Marty's theorem.

Theorem A. *Let $D \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ be a domain and $C > 0$. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a family of functions meromorphic in D such that*

$$f^\#(z) \geq C \qquad \text{for all } z \in D \text{ and all } f \in \mathcal{F}.$$

Then $\mathcal{F}$ is normal in D.

Hence, the condition $\frac{|f'|}{1+|f|^2}(z) = f^\#(z) \geq C$ can be considered as a differential inequality that induces normality. In [1], [2], [4], [5] and [8] we studied more general differential inequalities, involving higher derivatives, with respect to the question whether they induce normality or at least quasi-normality.

Before summarizing the main results from these studies, as far as they are relevant in the context of the present paper, we would like to remind the reader of the definition of quasi-normality and also to introduce some notations.

A family $\mathcal{F}$ of meromorphic functions in a domain $D \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ is said to be *quasi-normal* if from each sequence $\{f_n\}_n$ in $\mathcal{F}$ one can extract a subsequence which converges locally

uniformly (with respect to the spherical metric) on $D \setminus E$ where the set E (which may depend on $\{f_n\}_n$) has no accumulation point in D. If the exceptional set E can always be chosen to have at most q points, yet for some sequence there actually occur q such points, then we say that $\mathcal{F}$ is *quasi-normal of order q*.

For $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}$ and $r > 0$, we set $\Delta(z_0, r) := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z - z_0| < r\}$. By $\mathcal{M}(D)$ we denote the space of all functions meromorphic in a domain D. We write P_f and Z_f for the set of poles resp. for the set of zeros of a meromorphic function f, and we use the notation "$f_n \Longrightarrow f$ (on D)" to indicate that the sequence $\{f_n\}_n$ converges to f locally uniformly in D (with respect to the spherical metric or in the holomorphic case with respect to the Euclidean metric). Finally, we make use not only of the well-known Landau notation $a_n = O(b_n)$, but also of $a_n = \Omega(b_n)$ which means that $\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{|a_n|}{|b_n|} > 0$. (The usage of $\Omega(.)$ is quite ambiguous in literature. Our definition is the one given by D. Knuth.)

Now we can turn to the results on differential inequalities and (quasi-)normality known so far. While [4] and [5] dealt with generalizations of Marty's theorem (more precisely with conditions of the form $\frac{|f^{(k)}|}{1+|f|^\alpha}(z) \le C$), in [1], [2] and [8] the following extensions of Theorem A were proved.

Theorem B. *Let $k \ge 1$ and $j \ge 0$ be integers and $C > 0$, $\alpha > 1$ be real numbers. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a family of meromorphic functions in some domain D.*

(a) *[2] If*

$$\frac{|f^{(k)}|}{1+|f|^\alpha}(z) \ge C \qquad \text{for all } z \in D \text{ and all } f \in \mathcal{F},$$

then $\mathcal{F}$ is normal.

(b) *[8] If*

$$\frac{|f'|}{1+|f|}(z) \ge C \qquad \text{for all } z \in D \text{ and all } f \in \mathcal{F},$$

then $\mathcal{F}$ is quasi-normal.

(c) *[1] If $k > j$ and*

$$\frac{|f^{(k)}|}{1+|f^{(j)}|^\alpha}(z) \ge C \qquad \text{for all } z \in D \text{ and all } f \in \mathcal{F},$$

then $\mathcal{F}$ is quasi-normal in D. If all functions in $\mathcal{F}$ are holomorphic, $\mathcal{F}$ is quasi-normal of order at most $j-1$. (For $j = 0$ and $j = 1$ this means that it is normal.)

In (a), one can expect only quasi-normality if $\alpha = 1$, not normality. This is demonstrated by the family $\{z \mapsto nz^k : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ which is not normal at $z = 0$.

As to (c), there is no reasonable way to extend it to the case $\alpha = 1$ if $j \ge 1$ as we have already pointed out in [1]: The sequence of the functions $f_n(z) := z^n - 3^n$ satisfies $\frac{|f_n^{(k)}|}{1+|f_n^{(j)}|} \Longrightarrow \infty$ on the annulus $\{z \in \mathbb{C} : 2 < |z| < 4\}$ whenever $k > j \ge 1$, but $\{f_n\}_n$ is

not normal at any point z with $|z| = 3$, hence it isn't quasi-normal. In fact, it isn't even Q_α-normal for any ordinal number α. (For the exact definition of Q_α-normality we refer to [9].) The same example also shows that (a) cannot be extended to the case $\alpha < 1$ (see [8, Theorem 2] for details).

So the question remains whether part (b) of Theorem B can be extended to higher derivatives. In this paper we answer this question affirmatively.

Theorem 1. *Let k be a natural number and $C > 0$. Let $\mathcal{F}_k$ be the family of all meromorphic functions f in some domain D satisfying*

$$\frac{|f^{(k)}|}{1+|f|}(z) \geq C \qquad \text{for all } z \in D.$$

Then $\mathcal{F}_k$ is quasi-normal in D.

In the spirit of Bloch's heuristic principle, one might ask for a corresponding result for functions meromorphic in the whole complex plane. Indeed, such a result holds, but it is quite trivial: If $f \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{C})$ would satisfy $\frac{|f^{(k)}|}{1+|f|}(z) \geq C > 0$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C}$, then $f^{(k)}$ would be a constant by Montel's theorem, so f would be a polynomial of degree k. This would imply $\lim_{z\to\infty} \frac{|f^{(k)}|}{1+|f|}(z) = 0$, a contradiction. So there aren't any functions $f \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{C})$ at all which satisfy $\frac{|f^{(k)}|}{1+|f|}(z) \geq C$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C}$.

In Theorem 1 the order of quasi-normality can be arbitrarily large, even if we restrict to holomorphic functions, as the sequence of the functions $f_n(z) := n(e^z - 1)$ on the strip $D := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : -1 < \operatorname{Re}(z) < 1\}$ demonstrates. Obviously, every subsequence of $\{f_n\}_n$ is not normal exactly at the points $z_j = 2j\pi i$ with $j \in \mathbb{Z}$, so $\{f_n\}_n$ is quasi-normal of infinite order in D. But for every natural number k we have

$$\frac{|f_n^{(k)}|}{1+|f_n|}(z) = \frac{|e^z|}{\frac{1}{n}+|e^z-1|} \geq \frac{1}{e(2+e)} \qquad \text{for all } z \in D \text{ and all } n.$$

2 Some lemmas

The most essential tool in our proof is the famous rescaling lemma of L. Zalcman [13] and X.-C. Pang [10, 11]. Here we require the following version from [12].

Lemma 2 (Zalcman-Pang Lemma). *Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a family of meromorphic functions in a domain D all of whose zeros have multiplicity at least m and all of whose poles have multiplicity at least p and let $-p < \alpha < m$. If $\mathcal{F}$ is not normal at some $z_0 \in D$, then there exist sequences $\{f_n\}_n \subseteq \mathcal{F}$, $\{z_n\}_n \subseteq D$ and $\{\varrho_n\}_n \subseteq (0,1)$ such that $\{\varrho_n\}_n$ tends to 0, $\{z_n\}_n$ tends to z_0 and such that the sequence $\{g_n\}_n$ defined by*

$$g_n(\zeta) := \frac{1}{\varrho_n^\alpha} \cdot f_n(z_n + \varrho_n \zeta)$$

converges locally uniformly in $\mathbb{C}$ (with respect to the spherical metric) to a non-constant function g meromorphic in $\mathbb{C}$.

Furthermore, we need the following well-known normality criterion due to Y. Gu [6] which corresponds to Hayman's alternative.

Lemma 3. *Let $k \geq 1$ be an integer. Then the family of all functions f meromorphic in a domain $D \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ satisfying $f(z) \neq 0$, $f^{(k)}(z) \neq 1$ for every $z \in D$ is normal.*

In our proof the concept of differential polynomials turns out to be helpful to simplify notations. For the convenience of the reader we first recall the notions relevant in this context:

Definition. *Let $D \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ be an arbitrary domain. A mapping $M : \mathcal{M}(D) \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}(D)$ given by*

$$M[u] = a \cdot \prod_{\nu=1}^{d} u^{(k_\nu)} \quad \text{for all } u \in \mathcal{M}(D)$$

with $d \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $a \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ and $k_1, \ldots, k_d \in \mathbb{N}_0$ is called a **differential monomial** *of* **degree** $\deg(M) := d$ *and* **weight** $w(M) := \sum_{\nu=1}^{d}(1 + k_\nu)$.

A sum $P := M_1 + \cdots + M_p$ of differential monomials $M_1, \ldots, M_p$ which are linearly independent over $\mathcal{M}(D)$ is called a **differential polynomial** *of* **degree** $\deg(P) := \max\{\deg(M_1), \ldots, \deg(M_p)\}$ *and* **weight** $w(P) := \max\{w(M_1), \ldots, w(M_p)\}$. *Obviously, we have $\deg(P) \leq w(P)$.*

If $\deg(M_1) = \cdots = \deg(M_p) =: d$, we call P **homogeneous (of degree d)**.

For every differential polynomial P there exists a differential polynomial P' such that $P'[u](z) = (P[u])'(z)$ for all $u \in \mathcal{M}(D)$ and all $z \in D$. It is easy to see that $\deg(P') = \deg(P)$ and $w(P') \geq w(P)$.

The following lemma is used in two slightly different situations within our proof.

Lemma 4. *Let m and j be natural numbers. Then for any meromorphic function g in a domain D we have*

$$\left(\frac{g}{g^{(j)}}\right)^{(m)} = \frac{g^{(m)}}{g^{(j)}} - \frac{g}{g^{(j)}} \cdot \frac{g^{(j+m)}}{g^{(j)}} + \frac{g}{g^{(j)}} \cdot \frac{Q_m\left[g^{(j)}\right]}{(g^{(j)})^m} + \sum_{\ell=1}^{m-1} \frac{g^{(m-\ell)}}{g^{(j)}} \cdot \frac{Q_\ell\left[g^{(j)}\right]}{(g^{(j)})^\ell}$$

where for $\ell = 1, \ldots, m$ the Q_ℓ are homogeneous differential polynomials of degree ℓ (or possibly $Q_\ell \equiv 0$), all differential monomials in Q_ℓ have weight 2ℓ and $Q_m[u]$ doesn't contain any higher derivatives than $u^{(m-1)}$.

Proof. First we show by induction that for any meromorphic function f and for all $\ell \geq 1$

$$\left(\frac{1}{f}\right)^{(\ell)} = -\frac{f^{(\ell)}}{f^2} + \frac{\widetilde{Q}_\ell[f]}{f^{\ell+1}} \tag{2.1}$$

where $\widetilde{Q}_1 \equiv 0$ and for $\ell \geq 2$ the $\widetilde{Q}_\ell$ are homogeneous differential polynomials of degree ℓ, all of whose differential monomials have weight 2ℓ and do not contain any higher derivatives than $u^{(\ell-1)}$.

Indeed, this is obviously true for $\ell = 1$, and if (2.1) holds for some $\ell \geq 1$, differentiating yields

$$\left(\frac{1}{f}\right)^{(\ell+1)} = -\frac{f^{(\ell+1)}}{f^2} + \frac{1}{f^{\ell+2}} \cdot \left(2f^{(l)}f'f^{\ell-1} + f \cdot \widetilde{Q}'_\ell[f] - (\ell+1) \cdot f' \cdot \widetilde{Q}_\ell[f]\right).$$

So if we set

$$\widetilde{Q}_{\ell+1}[f] := 2f^{(l)}f'f^{\ell-1} + f \cdot \widetilde{Q}'_\ell[f] - (\ell+1) \cdot f' \cdot \widetilde{Q}_\ell[f],$$

then (2.1) holds for $\ell + 1$ instead of ℓ, and $\widetilde{Q}_{\ell+1}$ has the desired properties.

Now inserting (2.1) into

$$\left(\frac{g}{g^{(j)}}\right)^{(m)} = \sum_{\ell=0}^{m} \binom{m}{\ell} \cdot g^{(m-\ell)} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{g^{(j)}}\right)^{(\ell)}$$

and noting that $\frac{g^{(j+\ell)}}{(g^{(j)})^2}$ can be written in the form

$$\frac{g^{(j+\ell)}}{(g^{(j)})^2} = \frac{(g^{(j)})^{\ell-1} \cdot g^{(j+\ell)}}{(g^{(j)})^{\ell+1}}$$

we immediately obtain the assertion of the lemma. ■

3 Proof of Theorem 1

We apply induction. The quasi-normality of $\mathcal{F}_1$ follows from Theorem B (b).

In order to make our proof as self-contained as possible, we include a simplified version of the proof of Theorem B (b) here: For every $f \in \mathcal{F}_1$ we have $\left|\frac{f}{f'}(z)\right| \leq \frac{1}{C}$ and $|f'(z)| \geq C$ for all $z \in D$. Thus $\left\{\frac{f}{f'} : f \in \mathcal{F}_1\right\}$ and $\{f' : f \in \mathcal{F}_1\}$ are normal in D by Montel's theorem. So for a given sequence $\{f_n\}_n$ in $\mathcal{F}_1$ we may assume (after moving to an appropriate subsequence which we still denote by $\{f_n\}_n$) that $\left\{\frac{f_n}{f'_n}\right\}_n$ converges to a holomorphic limit function h_0 and that $\{f'_n\}_n$ converges to some $d \in \mathcal{M}(D) \cup \{\infty\}$.

If $h_0 \not\equiv 0$, then we deduce that $\{f_n\}_n$ tends to $d \cdot h_0$ locally uniformly in $D \setminus Z_{h_0}$. (Here $d \cdot h_0$ is understood to be $\equiv \infty$ if $d \equiv \infty$.) Since the zero set Z_{h_0} is isolated in D, $\{f_n\}_n$ turns out to be quasi-normal in D.

Now we consider the case $h_0 \equiv 0$ and show that in this case $\{f_n\}_n$ is normal in the whole of D. We assume that $\{f_n\}_n$ is not normal at some point $z_0 \in D$. Then from Gu's Theorem (Lemma 3) and the fact that f'_n omits the value $\frac{C}{2}$ we can conclude that there is a sequence $\{z_n\}_n$ tending to z_0 such that $f_n(z_n) = 0$ for n large enough. By Weierstraß' theorem we have

$$0 \equiv h_0 \Longleftarrow \left(\frac{f_n}{f'_n}\right)' = 1 - \frac{f_n f''_n}{(f'_n)^2}$$

and in particular

$$0 = \lim_{n\to\infty} \left(1 - \frac{f_n f''_n}{(f'_n)^2}\right)(z_n) = 1,$$

a contradiction. This shows that $\{f_n\}_n$ is normal in D for $h_0 \equiv 0$ and completes the proof of the theorem for $k = 1$.

Let some $k \geq 2$ be given and assume that it is already known that (on arbitrary domains) each of the conditions

$$\frac{|f'|}{1+|f|}(z) \geq C, \ldots, \frac{|f^{(k-1)}|}{1+|f|}(z) \geq C$$

implies quasi-normality.

Let $\{f_n\}_n$ be some sequence in $\mathcal{F}_k$. As in the case $k = 1$, from

$$|f_n^{(k)}(z)| \geq C \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{|f_n(z)|}{|f_n^{(k)}(z)|} \leq \frac{1}{C} \qquad \text{for all } z \in D \text{ and all } n$$

and from Montel's theorem we conclude that $\left\{f_n^{(k)}\right\}_n$ and $\left\{\frac{f_n}{f_n^{(k)}}\right\}_n$ are normal, so after turning to an appropriate subsequence we may assume that $\left\{f_n^{(k)}\right\}_n$ converges locally uniformly in D to some limit function $d \in \mathcal{M}(D) \cup \{\infty\}$ and that $\left\{\frac{f_n}{f_n^{(k)}}\right\}_n$ converges to some holomorphic limit function h_0. Now we consider several cases.

Case 1: There is an $m \in \{1, \ldots, k-1\}$ such that a subsequence of $\left\{\frac{f_n^{(m)}}{f_n^{(k)}}\right\}_n$ converges to ∞ locally uniformly in D.

Without loss of generality we may assume that the sequence $\left\{\frac{f_n^{(m)}}{f_n^{(k)}}\right\}_n$ itself converges to ∞. Then for any compact disk $\overline{\Delta(z_0, r)} \subseteq D$ we have for n large enough, say for $n \geq n_0$

$$|f_n^{(m)}(z)| \geq |f_n^{(k)}(z)| \qquad \text{for all } z \in \overline{\Delta(z_0, r)}.$$

But this means

$$\frac{|f_n^{(m)}|}{1+|f_n|}(z) \geq C \qquad \text{for all } z \in \overline{\Delta(z_0, r)} \text{ and all } n \geq n_0,$$

so $\{f_n\}_n$ is quasi-normal in $\Delta(z_0, r)$ by the induction hypothesis. Since this holds at any point $z_0 \in D$, we deduce the quasi-normality of $\{f_n\}_n$ in the whole of D.

Case 2: $d \in \mathcal{M}(D)$.

Let z_0 be an arbitrary point in D which is not a pole of d. Then there is an $r > 0$ and an $M < \infty$ such that $\overline{\Delta(z_0, r)} \subseteq D$ and $|d(z)| \leq M - 1$ for all $z \in \overline{\Delta(z_0, r)}$. So for n large enough we obtain

$$\frac{M}{1+|f_n(z)|} \geq \frac{|f_n^{(k)}(z)|}{1+|f_n(z)|} \geq C, \quad \text{hence} \quad |f_n(z)| \leq \frac{M}{C} \qquad \text{for all } z \in \overline{\Delta(z_0, r)}.$$

Therefore $\{f_n\}_n$ is normal in $\Delta(z_0, r)$ by Montel's theorem. This shows that $\{f_n\}_n$ is normal in $D \setminus P_d$. Since the poles of d are isolated in D, we obtain the quasi-normality of $\{f_n\}_n$ in D.

Case 3: $h_0 \not\equiv 0$.

Here we can conclude that $\{f_n\}_n$ tends to $d \cdot h_0$ in $D \setminus Z_{h_0}$. Since Z_{h_0} is isolated in D, again we have quasi-normality of $\{f_n\}_n$.

Case 4: $h_0 \equiv 0$, $d \equiv \infty$, and there doesn't exist an $m \in \{1, \ldots, k-1\}$ such that a subsequence of $\left\{\frac{f_n^{(m)}}{f_n^{(k)}}\right\}_n$ converges to ∞ locally uniformly in D.

This case turns out to be the most recalcitrant one. To deal with it we will extensively consider the functions $\frac{f_n^{(\mu)}}{f_n^{(k)}}$ with $\mu < k$ and their behaviour at certain points close to a given point of non-normality. It is useful to note that these functions are holomorphic since $f_n^{(k)}$ has no zeros and since poles of f_n are zeros of $\frac{f_n^{(\mu)}}{f_n^{(k)}}$.

Claim 1. Let $\mu \in \{1, \ldots, k-1\}$ be given and assume that

$$\frac{f_n^{(\mu+1)}}{f_n^{(k)}} \Longrightarrow h_{\mu+1}, \ldots, \frac{f_n^{(k-1)}}{f_n^{(k)}} \Longrightarrow h_{k+1}$$

where the limit functions $h_{\mu+1}, \ldots, h_{k-1}$ are holomorphic. (Of course, for $\mu = k-1$ this assumption is meant to be void.) Then $\left\{\frac{f_n^{(\mu)}}{f_n^{(k)}}\right\}_n$ is normal.

Proof of Claim 1. Let's assume that $\left\{\frac{f_n^{(\mu)}}{f_n^{(k)}}\right\}_n$ is not normal at some point $z_0 \in D$. Then, since the functions $\frac{f_n^{(\mu)}}{f_n^{(k)}}$ don't have any poles, we can apply the Zalcman-Pang lemma (Lemma 2) with $\alpha = -\mu$. So (after turning to an appropriate subsequence of $\{f_n\}_n$) we find sequences $\{z_n\}_n \subseteq D$ and $\{\varrho_n\}_n \subseteq (0,1)$ such that $\{\varrho_n\}_n$ tends to 0, $\{z_n\}_n$ tends to z_0 and such that the sequence $\{g_n\}_n$ defined by

$$g_n(\zeta) := \varrho_n^{\mu} \cdot \frac{f_n^{(\mu)}}{f_n^{(k)}}(z_n + \varrho_n \zeta) \tag{3.1}$$

converges locally uniformly in $\mathbb{C}$ to a non-constant entire function g. We choose an arbitrary $\zeta_0 \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $g(\zeta_0) \neq 0$ and consider the quantities

$$A_n := \frac{f_n^{(\mu)}}{f_n^{(k)}}(z_n + \varrho_n \zeta_0)$$

which satisfy

$$A_n \sim \frac{g(\zeta_0)}{\varrho_n^{\mu}}, \tag{3.2}$$

in particular $\lim_{n\to\infty} A_n = \infty$.

Claim 1.1.

$$\frac{f_n^{(k+m)}}{f_n^{(k)}}(z_n + \varrho_n \zeta_0) = O(\varrho_n^{-m}) \qquad \text{for } m = 1, \ldots, k-1. \tag{3.3}$$

Proof of Claim 1.1. By differentiating (3.1) we obtain

$$\varrho_n^{\mu+1} \cdot \left(\frac{f_n^{(\mu+1)}}{f_n^{(k)}} - \frac{f_n^{(\mu)}}{f_n^{(k)}} \cdot \frac{f_n^{(k+1)}}{f_n^{(k)}} \right) (z_n + \varrho_n \zeta) \Longrightarrow g'(\zeta) \qquad \text{in } \mathbb{C}.$$

Here $\left\{ \frac{f_n^{(\mu+1)}}{f_n^{(k)}}(z_n + \varrho_n \zeta) \right\}_n$ tends to the finite value $h_{\mu+1}(z_0)$ locally uniformly in $\mathbb{C}$. (Note that this is also true for $\mu = k-1$ if we set $h_k :\equiv 1$.) So we also have

$$\varrho_n^{\mu+1} \cdot \frac{f_n^{(\mu)}}{f_n^{(k)}} \cdot \frac{f_n^{(k+1)}}{f_n^{(k)}} (z_n + \varrho_n \zeta) \Longrightarrow -g'(\zeta) \qquad \text{in } \mathbb{C}$$

and in particular

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \varrho_n^{\mu+1} \cdot A_n \cdot \frac{f_n^{(k+1)}}{f_n^{(k)}} (z_n + \varrho_n \zeta_0) = -g'(\zeta_0).$$

Combining this with (3.2) yields $\frac{f_n^{(k+1)}}{f_n^{(k)}}(z_n + \varrho_n \zeta_0) = O(\varrho_n^{-1})$, i.e. the assertion for $m = 1$.

Now assume that, for given $m \in \{2, \ldots, k-1\}$,

$$\frac{f_n^{(k+r)}}{f_n^{(k)}} (z_n + \varrho_n \zeta_0) = O(\varrho_n^{-r}) \qquad \text{holds for } r = 1, \ldots, m-1. \tag{3.4}$$

If we differentiate (3.1) m-times and apply Lemma 4 with $g := f_n^{(\mu)}$ and $j = k - \mu$, condensing the representation given there in a way sufficient for our current purpose, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} g^{(m)}(\zeta) &\Longleftarrow \varrho_n^{m+\mu} \left(\frac{f_n^{(\mu)}}{f_n^{(k)}} \right)^{(m)} (z_n + \varrho_n \zeta) \\ &= \varrho_n^{m+\mu} \left(-\frac{f_n^{(\mu)}}{f_n^{(k)}} \frac{f_n^{(k+m)}}{f_n^{(k)}} + \sum_{\ell=0}^{m} \frac{f_n^{(\mu+m-\ell)}}{f_n^{(k)}} \cdot \frac{Q_\ell \left[f_n^{(k)} \right]}{(f_n^{(k)})^\ell} \right) (z_n + \varrho_n \zeta), \end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

where $Q_0 \equiv 1$ and for $\ell \geq 1$ the Q_ℓ are homogeneous differential polynomials of degree ℓ, all differential monomials in Q_ℓ have weight 2ℓ and $Q_m[u]$ doesn't contain any higher derivatives than $u^{(m-1)}$.

Here we can write

$$\frac{Q_\ell \left[f_n^{(k)} \right]}{(f_n^{(k)})^\ell} = \sum_{\sigma=1}^{s_\ell} c_{\ell,\sigma} \prod_{\nu=1}^{\ell} \frac{f_n^{(d_{\ell,\sigma,\nu}+k)}}{f_n^{(k)}}$$

with certain constants $c_{\ell,\sigma} \in \mathbb{C}$, $s_\ell \geq 0$ and $d_{\ell,\sigma,\nu} \geq 0$, where $d_{\ell,\sigma,1} + \cdots + d_{\ell,\sigma,\ell} = \ell$. For $\ell \leq m-1$ all $d_{\ell,\sigma,\nu}$ are $\leq m-1$, and in view of the special property of Q_m this also remains valid for $\ell = m$. So from (3.4) we can conclude that

$$\frac{Q_\ell \left[f_n^{(k)} \right]}{(f_n^{(k)})^\ell} (z_n + \varrho_n \zeta_0) = O(\varrho_n^{-\ell}) \qquad \text{for } \ell = 0, \ldots, m. \tag{3.6}$$

Furthermore, from (3.4) and the assumption on the existence of the limit functions $h_{\mu+1}, \dots, h_{k-1}$ we can conclude that for $\ell = 0, \dots, m-1$ we have[1]

$$\frac{f_n^{(\mu+m-\ell)}}{f_n^{(k)}}(z_n + \varrho_n\zeta_0) = \begin{cases} O(\varrho_n^{-\mu-m+\ell+k}) & \text{if } \mu+m-\ell > k, \\ O(1) & \text{if } \mu+m-\ell \le k. \end{cases} \tag{3.7}$$

If we combine (3.6) and (3.7), we obtain for all $\ell = 0, \dots, m-1$

$$\left(\frac{f_n^{(\mu+m-\ell)}}{f_n^{(k)}} \cdot \frac{Q_\ell\left[f_n^{(k)}\right]}{(f_n^{(k)})^\ell} \right)(z_n + \varrho_n\zeta_0) = O(\varrho_n^{-\mu-m+1}).$$

(Indeed, this is true in both cases $\mu+m-\ell > k$ and $\mu+m-\ell \le k$.)

Furthermore, in view of (3.2) and (3.6) we also have

$$\left(\frac{f_n^{(\mu)}}{f_n^{(k)}} \cdot \frac{Q_m\left[f_n^{(k)}\right]}{(f_n^{(k)})^m} \right)(z_n + \varrho_n\zeta_0) = O(\varrho_n^{-\mu-m}).$$

Now we take a look again at (3.5): Inserting $\zeta = \zeta_0$, we obtain for $n \to \infty$

$$\begin{aligned} &\varrho_n^{m+\mu} \left(\underbrace{A_n}_{=\Omega(\varrho_n^{-\mu})} \cdot \frac{f_n^{(k+m)}}{f_n^{(k)}} - \underbrace{\frac{f_n^{(\mu)}}{f_n^{(k)}} \cdot \frac{Q_m\left[f_n^{(k)}\right]}{(f_n^{(k)})^m}}_{=O(\varrho_n^{-\mu-m})} - \underbrace{\sum_{\ell=0}^{m-1} \frac{f_n^{(\mu+m-\ell)}}{f_n^{(k)}} \cdot \frac{Q_\ell\left[f_n^{(k)}\right]}{(f_n^{(k)})^\ell}}_{=O(\varrho_n^{-\mu-m+1})} \right)(z_n + \varrho_n\zeta_0) \\ &\longrightarrow -g^{(m)}(\zeta_0), \end{aligned}$$

and we can conclude that $\frac{f_n^{(k+m)}}{f_n^{(k)}}(z_n + \varrho_n\zeta_0) = O(\varrho_n^{-m})$. So by induction Claim 1.1 is proved for all $m = 1, \dots, k-1$. □

Claim 1.2. If there is some $m \in \{2, \dots, k-1\}$ such that

$$\frac{f_n^{(m)}}{f_n^{(k)}}(z_n + \varrho_n\zeta_0) = \Omega(\varrho_n^{-m}), \tag{3.8}$$

then we can find a $j \in \{1, \dots, m-1\}$ such that

$$\frac{f_n^{(m-j)}}{f_n^{(k)}}(z_n + \varrho_n\zeta_0) = \Omega(\varrho_n^{-m+j}).$$

Proof of Claim 1.2. Differentiating $\frac{f_n}{f_n^{(k)}} \Longrightarrow 0$ m-times and again applying Lemma 4 (this time choosing a slightly different way of condensing the representation given there

[1]Here, for applying (3.4) it is crucial that $m+\mu-\ell \le k+m-1$.

than in the proof of Claim 1.1), we obtain

$$0 \Longleftarrow \left(\frac{f_n}{f_n^{(k)}}\right)^{(m)} = \frac{f_n^{(m)}}{f_n^{(k)}} + \frac{f_n}{f_n^{(k)}} \cdot \frac{Q_m\left[f_n^{(k)}\right]}{(f_n^{(k)})^m} + \sum_{\ell=1}^{m-1} \frac{f_n^{(m-\ell)}}{f_n^{(k)}} \cdot \frac{Q_\ell\left[f_n^{(k)}\right]}{(f_n^{(k)})^\ell} \tag{3.9}$$

where the Q_ℓ are homogeneous differential polynomials of degree ℓ and all differential monomials in Q_ℓ have weight 2ℓ. Again we have

$$\frac{Q_\ell\left[f_n^{(k)}\right]}{(f_n^{(k)})^\ell} = \sum_{\sigma=1}^{s_\ell} c_{\ell,\sigma} \prod_{\nu=1}^{\ell} \frac{f_n^{(d_{\ell,\sigma,\nu}+k)}}{f_n^{(k)}}$$

with certain constants $c_{\ell,\sigma} \in \mathbb{C}$, $s_\ell \geq 0$ and $d_{\ell,\sigma,\nu} \geq 0$, where $d_{\ell,\sigma,1} + \cdots + d_{\ell,\sigma,\ell} = \ell\,(\leq m \leq k-1)$. Therefore from Claim 1.1 we deduce

$$\frac{Q_\ell\left[f_n^{(k)}\right]}{(f_n^{(k)})^\ell}(z_n + \varrho_n\zeta_0) = O(\varrho_n^{-\ell}) \qquad \text{for } \ell = 1, \ldots, m.$$

Now inserting this estimate into (3.9) and using $\frac{f_n}{f_n^{(k)}} \Longrightarrow 0$ and (3.8) we obtain

$$\left(\underbrace{\frac{f_n^{(m)}}{f_n^{(k)}}}_{=\Omega(\varrho_n^{-m})} + \underbrace{\frac{f_n}{f_n^{(k)}}}_{\longrightarrow 0} \cdot \underbrace{\frac{Q_m\left[f_n^{(k)}\right]}{(f_n^{(k)})^m}}_{=O(\varrho_n^{-m})} + \sum_{\ell=1}^{m-1} \frac{f_n^{(m-\ell)}}{f_n^{(k)}} \cdot \underbrace{\frac{Q_\ell\left[f_n^{(k)}\right]}{(f_n^{(k)})^\ell}}_{=O(\varrho_n^{-\ell})}\right)(z_n + \varrho_n\zeta_0) \longrightarrow 0 \quad (n \to \infty)$$

which shows us that there must be a $j \in \{1, \ldots, m-1\}$ such that

$$\frac{f_n^{(m-j)}}{f_n^{(k)}}(z_n + \varrho_n\zeta_0) = \Omega(\varrho_n^{-m+j}).$$

This proofs Claim 1.2. □

Now we can complete the proof of Claim 1.

If $\mu \geq 2$, then from Claim 1.2 and the fact that (3.8) holds for $m = \mu$ by our choice of ζ_0 (see (3.2)) we deduce that for a suitable $j \in \{1, \ldots, \mu-1\}$ we have

$$\frac{f_n^{(\mu-j)}}{f_n^{(k)}}(z_n + \varrho_n\zeta_0) = \Omega(\varrho_n^{-\mu+j}).$$

Iterated application of Claim 1.2 (with $m = \mu - j$ and so on) shows that

$$\frac{f_n'}{f_n^{(k)}}(z_n + \varrho_n\zeta_0) = \Omega(\varrho_n^{-1}),$$

and this of course remains valid also for $\mu = 1$ (again by our choice of ζ_0).

But on the other hand, from $h_0 \equiv 0$ by Weierstraß' theorem we conclude that

$$\frac{f_n'}{f_n^{(k)}} - \frac{f_n}{f_n^{(k)}} \cdot \frac{f_n^{(k+1)}}{f_n^{(k)}} \Longrightarrow 0,$$

hence, using Claim 1.1

$$\underbrace{\frac{f_n'}{f_n^{(k)}}(z_n + \varrho_n\zeta_0)}_{=\Omega(\varrho_n^{-1})} - \underbrace{\frac{f_n}{f_n^{(k)}}(z_n + \varrho_n\zeta_0)}_{\longrightarrow 0} \cdot \underbrace{\frac{f_n^{(k+1)}}{f_n^{(k)}}(z_n + \varrho_n\zeta_0)}_{=O(\varrho_n^{-1})} \longrightarrow 0 \qquad (n \to \infty).$$

This yields a contradiction, thus completing the proof of Claim 1. ■

Applying Claim 1 with $m = k-1$ (where the additional assumption is void), we first see that $\left\{\frac{f_n^{(k-1)}}{f_n^{(k)}}\right\}_n$ is normal, and without loss of generality we may assume that it tends to some limit function h_{k-1}. By the general assumption in Case 4 we have $h_{k-1} \not\equiv \infty$. So we can apply Claim 1 once more, with $m = k-2$, to deduce the normality of $\left\{\frac{f_n^{(k-2)}}{f_n^{(k)}}\right\}_n$. Continuing in this way, we recursively find that (after turning to suitable subsequences) all sequences $\left\{\frac{f_n^{(m)}}{f_n^{(k)}}\right\}_n$ with $m = 1, \ldots, k-1$ tend to holomorphic limit functions h_m. Furthermore, we know that $\left\{\frac{f_n}{f_n^{(k)}}\right\}_n$ tends to $h_0 \equiv 0$. So by Weierstraß' theorem we also have

$$\frac{f_n^{(m+1)}}{f_n^{(k)}} - \frac{f_n^{(m)}}{f_n^{(k)}} \cdot \frac{f_n^{(k+1)}}{f_n^{(k)}} = \left(\frac{f_n^{(m)}}{f_n^{(k)}}\right)' \Longrightarrow h_m' \quad \text{for } m = 0, \ldots, k-1. \tag{3.10}$$

Assume that $h_{m_0} \not\equiv 0$ for some $m_0 \in \{1, \ldots, k-1\}$. Then from (3.10) we deduce that $\left\{\frac{f_n^{(k+1)}}{f_n^{(k)}}\right\}_n$ tends to some meromorphic limit function L in $D \setminus Z_{h_{m_0}}$. Again by (3.10) we obtain in $D \setminus Z_{h_{m_0}}$

$$h_{m+1} - h_m \cdot L = h_m' \quad \text{for } m = 0, \ldots, k-1.$$

From this and from $h_0 \equiv 0$ we successively conclude that $h_1 \equiv 0$, $h_2 \equiv 0, \ldots, h_{m_0} \equiv 0$, a contradiction.

So all limit functions $h_0, \ldots, h_{k-1}$ are 0, i.e. it only remains to consider the situation that (after the usual extraction of appropriate subsequences) each of the sequences $\left\{\frac{f_n}{f_n^{(k)}}\right\}_n, \left\{\frac{f_n'}{f_n^{(k)}}\right\}_n, \ldots, \left\{\frac{f_n^{(k-1)}}{f_n^{(k)}}\right\}_n$ tends to 0 locally uniformly in D. Here, by Weierstraß' theorem we obtain for $m = 1, \ldots, k$

$$0 \iff \left(\frac{f_n^{(k-m)}}{f_n^{(k)}}\right)^{(m)} = \sum_{j=0}^{m} \binom{m}{j} \cdot f_n^{(k-j)} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{f_n^{(k)}}\right)^{(j)} = \sum_{j=0}^{k} \binom{m}{j} \cdot f_n^{(k-j)} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{f_n^{(k)}}\right)^{(j)}.$$

(Note that $\binom{m}{j} = 0$ for $j > m$.)

Now we use the fact that the truncated (non-symmetric) Pascal matrix

$$A_k := \left(\binom{m}{j}\right)_{\substack{m=1,\dots,k\\ j=0,\dots,k-1}} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 2 & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 3 & 3 & 1 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots \\ 1 & k-1 & \binom{k-1}{2} & \binom{k-1}{3} & \dots & \binom{k-1}{k-2} & 1 \\ 1 & k & \binom{k}{2} & \binom{k}{3} & \dots & \binom{k}{k-2} & \binom{k}{k-1} \end{pmatrix}$$

is regular. This is a special case of a result of S. Kersey ([7, Theorem 1.1]) which states that such a submatrix of the Pascal matrix is regular if and only if there aren't any zeros on the diagonal[2].

Therefore there exists a vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^k$ such that $v^T A_k = (1, 0, \dots, 0)$, i.e.

$$\sum_{m=1}^{k} v_m \cdot \binom{m}{j} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } j = 0, \\ 0 & \text{for } j = 1, \dots, k-1. \end{cases}$$

This yields

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \iff & \sum_{m=1}^{k} v_m \cdot \sum_{j=0}^{k} \binom{m}{j} \cdot f_n^{(k-j)} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{f_n^{(k)}}\right)^{(j)} \\ = & \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \sum_{m=1}^{k} v_m \cdot \binom{m}{j} \cdot f_n^{(k-j)} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{f_n^{(k)}}\right)^{(j)} + v_k \cdot f_n \cdot \left(\frac{1}{f_n^{(k)}}\right)^{(k)} \\ = & 1 + v_k \cdot f_n \cdot \left(\frac{1}{f_n^{(k)}}\right)^{(k)}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

If $\{f_n\}_n$ would be not normal at some point $z_0 \in D$, then from Gu's theorem (Lemma 3) and the fact that the $f_n^{(k)}$ omit the value $\frac{C}{2} \neq 0$ we could conclude that there is a sequence $\{z_n\}_n$ tending to z_0 such that $f_n(z_n) = 0$ for n large enough. Inserting this into (3.11) yields

$$0 = \lim_{n\to\infty} \left(1 + v_k \cdot f_n \cdot \left(\frac{1}{f_n^{(k)}}\right)^{(k)}\right)(z_n) = 1,$$

[2]The regularity can also be proved by induction, by showing that A_k can be transformed by Gaussian elimination into the $k \times k$-matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

which is obviously regular. We omit the details.

a contradiction.

This completes the proof of Theorem 1.

References

[1] Bar, R.; Grahl, J; Nevo, S.: *Differential inequalities and quasi-normal families*, Anal. Math. Phys. **4** (2014), 63-71

[2] Chen, Q.; Nevo, S.; Pang, X.-C.: *A general differential inequality of the kth derivative that leads to normality*, Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. **38** (2013), 691-695

[3] Grahl, J.; Nevo, S.: *Spherical derivatives and normal families*, J. Anal. Math. **117** (2012), 119-128

[4] Grahl, J.; Nevo, S.: *An extension of one direction in Marty's normality criterion*, Monatsh. Math. **174** (2014), 205-217

[5] Grahl, J.; Nevo, S.; Pang, X.-C.: *A non-explicit counterexample to a problem of quasi-normality*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **406** (2013), 386-391

[6] Gu, Y.: *A criterion for normality of families of meromorphic functions*, Sci. Sinica (special issue) **1** (1979), 267-274.

[7] Kersey, S.: *Invertibility of submatrices of Pascal's matrix and Birkhoff interpolation*, arXiv:1303.6159

[8] Liu, X.J., Nevo, S. and Pang, X.C.: *Differential inequalities, normality and quasi-normality*, Acta Math. Sin., Engl. Ser. **30** (2014), 277-282

[9] Nevo, S.: *Transfinite extension to Q_m-normality theory*, Results Math. **44** (2003), 141-156

[10] Pang, X.: *Bloch's principle and normal criterion*, Sci. Sinica (7) **32** (1989), 782-791

[11] Pang, X.: *On normal criterion of meromorphic functions*, Sci. Sinica (5) **33** (1990), 521-527

[12] Pang, X.; Zalcman, L.: *Normal families and shared values*, Bull. Lond. Math. Soc. **32** (2000), 325-331

[13] Zalcman, L., *A heuristic principle in complex function theory*, Amer. Math. Monthly **82** (1975), 813-817.

Jürgen Grahl
University of Würzburg
Department of Mathematics
97074 Würzburg
Germany
e-mail: grahl@mathematik.uni-wuerzburg.de

Shahar Nevo
Bar-Ilan University
Department of Mathematics
Ramat-Gan 52900
Israel
e-mail: nevosh@math.biu.ac.il